Comments provided by:

Bridget Trosin

Marc Hershman Marine Policy Fellow

Washington Department of Ecology

bridget.emmett@ecy.wa.gov

(360)407-7125

PO Box 47600

Olympia, WA 98504-7600

Review of Action Agenda and supporting science from Biennial Science Work Plan

---

These are a series of components that we have identified as core elements of Marine Spatial Planning (MSP). There are several actions from the Action Agenda which support initial MSP efforts. Below is a review of the overall scope of MSP within the Action Agenda.

What are the distinct components of marine spatial planning that result in benefit added results? (Distinct components of MSP = Components of the MSP management process that are different than current resource management)

1) ***A comprehensive spatial management plan for a marine area*** which identifies current and future spatial and temporal distributions of human uses and marine resources (in map form)

PSP needs specific future goals to which NTA can be traced. PSP appears to be in the initial stages of data collection as evidenced by their data collection of human uses, ID of ecological processes and locations of habitat which support these process and ID of present and future location of shellfish beds based on HAB conditions. In order to be a fully completed MSP, comprehensive data sets will need to be collected and a process initiated that facilitates the decision making process for determining the location of present and future uses.

2) ***Public involvement in planning process*** to determine tradeoffs and achieve balance among competing social and ecological objectives. This includes identifying appropriate uses in time and space.

PSP has taken preliminary steps to support this MSP component by engaging stakeholders in the involvement of human use mapping and creating Local Integrating Organizations which coordinate

recovery actions. In order to be a fully functioning MSP planning process, much greater public involvement in the planning of MPAs and other spatial zones will need to take place.

3) ***Large scale, cross sectoral and cross jurisdictional*** planning and coordinated decision making

PSP has not yet initiated this type of coordinated decision making on 1 or more issues such as MPAs or aquaculture.

4) ***Information exchange formalized*** to support ecosystem-wide decision making

PSP has taken initial steps toward supporting ecosystem wide decision making by creating Local Integrating Organizations. However a more formalized information exchange at multiple levels will need to be created prior to initiating and leveraging resources for the MSP planning process.

Upland and Terrestrial

A1. Focus land development away from ecologically important and sensitive areas.

Recommendations:

Include how this relates to MSP:
Given the spatial nature of this action and sub strategies, this type of information would be useful for MSP activities. Collecting information particularly in terrestrial lands bordering coastal waters contributes to larger EBM model of coastal management and can contribute to MSP planning efforts.

The associated science research listed in the BSWP (p16) describe the collection of water flow characteristics to ID the most important areas to protect. Since this tool is useful to MSP practitioners, make sure they are aware of the development and utility of this tool.

Data collected in B1, NTA2 can also contribute to this overall action (A1).

Marine and Nearshore

B1. Use anticipated population and economic growth as a catalyst for recovery by building on existing efforts to establish protection and restoration priorities.

B1.1 Ensure complete, accurate and recent information directly assists shoreline planning and decision making at the site-specific and regional levels

Recommendations:

NTA1: Explain how this action of "developing work plan for network of MPAs in P.S." contributes to present and future MSP planning in Puget Sound. Provide context for how this fits into future planning and larger scope. For example, the development of the MPA work plan will lay out a framework for

interagency coordination and decision making for the establishment of MPAs in P.S. Coordination and information exchange is a crucial element of MSP at all scales, across jurisdictions and between sectors. It seems that discussion of MPAs fits better under B2 under 'protect and conserve relatively intach ecosystems'.

NTA2: Include discussion of how this action "ID human use patterns for MPAs in PS" contributes to present and future MSP planning in Puget Sound. For example this information provides information on where conflicts and certain types of impacts occur in the marine environment which can be used in the establishment of MPAs. This data set can also be used to support data sets collected in A1 by identifying areas that are heavily used by the recreation and fishing communities bridging gaps in ecological/ social interaction and terrestrial/ marine relationship in human uses.

B2. Protect and conserve relatively intact ecosystems to maintain the health of Puget Sound.

B2.1.Take actions that protect priority nearshore physical and ecological processes consistent with the Soundwide restoration priorities identified in B1.1

Recommendation:

Cite the connection of this action to MSP. "*If the priorities identified in B1.1 are recognized and incorporated into local comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances, the prioritization can help planners, restoration practitioners, and other decision-makers direct growth away from existing areas of high ecological value and towards areas where resource conservation is not the primary objective."*

B3. Implement and maintain priority nearshore and marine ecosystem restoration projects.

Supporting science research from the BSWP (p19) states:

"Developing the analytical tools to identify priority areas for protection and stewardship is a key need for these strategies. Valuable information is available on the status and historical changes in physical structure of marine and near shorelines. This information can assist in making decisions about the potential for restoration and protection. Information and analytical tools linking these to other key considerations that are important are lacking, however, and need to be improved.

Important improvements include:

-Incorporating additional physical attributes as well as biogenic structures like eelgrass, kelp, or coastal forest condition into estimates of ecosystem services provided by shorelines
-Assessing the impacts of barrier features on embayments
-Increasing understanding of the effects of protection and restoration at different spatial and ecological scales ranging from local domains (marshes, beaches, drift cells) to process domains (geomorphic units and salinity regimes) to landscape domains spanning many kilometers.
-More robustly incorporating rare forms, species, and processes in understanding landscape composition
-Including landscapes and habitats used by target species
-Incorporating threats to ecosystem services and potential for protection"

Recommendations:

We recommend acknowledging in the science work plan the connection of this research to MSP particularly the support of data and decision tools. These analytical tools can contribute to MSP data integration if shared among agencies.

In addition to the above improvements, incorporating human use data will allow for broader consideration of external pressures on proposed restoration sites.

B4. Protect, Support Economic Viability of Working Waterfronts to Help Maintain Ecosystem Function and Sustain Quality of Life

Emerging Issues and Future Opportunities:

-Support the recommendations contained in Marine Spatial Planning in Washington: Final Report and Recommendations of the State Ocean Caucus to the Washington State Legislature in particular Recommendation 4 which includes the following objectives:

-Foster and encourage sustainable uses that provide economic opportunity and preserve coastal heritage without significant adverse environmental impacts

-Preserve and enhance public access to, commercial and recreational uses of, and other values for marine waters and shorelines

-Protect and encourage working waterfronts and support the infrastructure necessary to sustain water-dependent uses such as marine industry, commercial shipping, commercial, tribal and recreational fisheries, and shellfish aquaculture"

Recommendations:

How will PSP support these? We recommend adding in NTA or future actions ,such as the following:

-Devote staff time within PSP to engage in MSP at the statewide level

-ID high value waterfronts and factors which contribute to high quality of life i.e. shellfish beds, beach access

-Support efforts to better understand economic drivers and opportunities for marine uses by all sectors

-Provide an analysis of impacts of future uses to determine sustainability

Reduce and Control the Sources of Pollution to Puget Sound

C9. Abundant, healthy shellfish for ecosystem health and for commercial, subsistence, and recreational harvest consistent with ecosystem protection.

C9. 4 Resolve competing priorities between aquaculture and near shore, habitat and upland uses.

C9.4NA1: Will support pre-planning and implementation of MSP and local shoreline master program updates by: gathering, compiling and ground truthing baseline information on current aquaculture and filling data gaps and completing research to identify areas that are suitable and unsuitable for future shellfish aquaculture.

Recommendations:

This is a good action.

Will the data collected have a spatial component for "identify areas that are suitable and unsuitable for future shellfish aquaculture?"

Determine process to identify criteria with agencies for allowing "future shellfish aquaculture areas"?

Research listed in the BSWP (p24) focus on HAB research. Are areas with potential for HAB the only criteria for determining these future aquaculture areas? Who is doing research to answer these questions? (Perhaps provide this in action agenda)

Strategic Leadership and Collaboration

D2. Strategic, Collaborative Partnerships
D2.1 Local Integrating Organizations: enhancing coordination and local recovery actions.

"In any given area, there are many local groups working on recovery-related activities, and these groups are often not adequately connected to each other. PSP is working with local interests to better coordinate implementing partners, and create a more efficient and effective approach to clarify local priorities, accomplish identified work, address problems, and provide technical support."

<u>Recommendations:</u>
Make NTAs such as:
- Devote consistent staff time to MSP initiatives
-List partnerships and coordination mechanisms which can be used to support MSP efforts. The creation of stakeholder engagement mechanisms and coordination of local efforts created by the Local Integrating Organizations supports MSP and can become a part of the extensive stakeholder outreach required in a future MSP planning process.
-For the LIOs, what is the relationship to existing authorities?
-Nest these efforts into larger state and regional efforts
-Link to existing information mechanisms and decision making processes. For example, acknowledge state actions and need for regional scope, particularly in aquaculture.